

## Category: LDR.3 Leadership

### Table of Contents

#### Area: LDR.3.1 Organizational/Human Resource Management

**Introduction** This section contains all elements related to organizational management and oversight in addition to training, personal development and mentoring.

---

Element Identifiers		Organizational Management	
New	Old	Element Title	Page #
LDR.3.1.1	CO.1.2.1	Support Agreements/Training Affiliation Agreements (TAA)	LDR 3-2
LDR.3.1.2	CO.1.2.2	Administration of the On-the-Job Training (OJT) Program	LDR 3-4
LDR.3.1.3	CO.1.2.3	Supervisory Involvement – On-the-Job Training (OJT)	LDR 3-6
LDR.3.1.4	CO.1.2.4	Basic Life Support (BLS) Training	LDR 3-8

## Element LDR.3.1.1 (formerly CO.1.2.1)

### Support Agreements/Training Affiliation Agreements (TAA)

---

#### Evaluation Criteria

- Training Affiliation Agreements (TAA)/Memoranda of Understanding (MOU) for training between medical organizations were prepared and processed IAW AFI 41-108 (ANG) and AFRCI 41-101 (AFRC)
    - The TAA/MOU was current and clearly outlined medical organization responsibilities
      - The TAA/MOU was dated and signed by the organization commanders or equivalent
      - The appropriate approval process was IAW governing directive (SJA, group/wing, Air Staff)
      - A description of the facilities entering into the agreement was included along with complete addresses
      - Liability requirements and responsibilities of the affiliating civilian institution were addressed
      - Roles and scope of practice were defined for each participant
      - TAAs/MOUs were reviewed for appropriateness and currency periodically (not less than every 3 yrs for ANG and 2 yrs for AFRES)
      - Renewal procedures, including formal review of the TAA by concerned parties, was completed at least 60 days prior to the termination date (AFRC)
  - Support agreements and/or MOUs/MOAs establishing supplier/receiver relationships between ARC and AD wings or organizations:
    - Were drafted to ensure clear identification of all support requirements
    - Were drafted to ensure AFRES and ANG receive the same level of support as other tenant units on the installation including base-level support services, annual tours, unit training assemblies, peacetime training in all areas, and weekend operations
    - Were revised with non-substantive changes (if necessary) via mutual agreement, using minor pen and ink changes
    - Were reviewed in their entirety every 3 years and approved per the original
- 

#### Scoring

- 4: Criteria met.
- 3: Discrepancies were minor, primarily administrative in nature, and unlikely to compromise mission support. For example:
  - TAAs/support agreements required minor revision to maximize effectiveness but were otherwise functional
- 2: Partial compliance with evaluation criteria. For example:
  - Agreements had surpassed their termination date but no review and approval had occurred and no MAJCOM deferment existed

- Support agreements were in place but did not clearly identify all support requirements, resulting in moderate shortfalls in training, supplies or services support

1: Minimal compliance with evaluation criteria. For example:

- TAAs/support agreements existed, but critical provisions weren't identified or adhered to and inadequate action had been taken to elevate or resolve the situation. Severe shortfalls in areas of training, supplies or services support occurred as a direct result

0: There was noncompliance with multiple evaluation criteria and/or compliance with basic program requirements was not evident. For example:

- Lack of necessary support agreements severely hindered the unit's ability to obtain crucial training, supplies, or services
- Tort liability had not been established for TAAs, thereby placing the government potentially at risk

NA: Not scored.

---

**Protocol**

There is no protocol for this element. TAAs and support agreements are typically evaluated without requiring an interview. Consultation will occur, as necessary.

---

**Inspector  
Contact**

For assistance interpreting this element, please call DSN 246-1771/2566 and request an AE nurse inspector.

---

**Reference(s)**

AFI 41-108; AFI 25-201; AFRCI 41-101; AFRCI 41-102; DoDI 4000.19

## Element LDR.3.1.2 (formerly CO.1.2.2)

### Administration of the On-the-Job Training (OJT) Program

---

#### Evaluation Criteria

- Unit education and training manager (UETM):
- Instructed and administered the Air Force Training Course
    - If UETM is not a 3S2X1, or qualified instructor, obtained assistance from the base training office
  - Conducted informal work center visits and maintained memos for future reference
    - Monitored corrective action and informed the commander of the status of corrections
  - Conducted squadron training meetings at least quarterly
    - Prepared meeting agenda/minutes, distributed to work centers and provided an information copy to the base training manager
  - Developed materials to support OJT
  - Maintained current copies of CFETPs, AFJQSs, and STSs for each enlisted specialty
  - Analyzed training data for trends
  - Formally assessed squadron training programs annually (18 months for AFRC/ANG)
    - Submitted a written report to the base education and training manager within 30 days of completion
  - Ensured work centers:
    - Met enlisted training plan and duty and skill requirements using a master career field education and training plan (MCFETP)
    - Conducted initial evaluation of knowledge and skills within 90 days of assignment
    - Planned and scheduled training
    - Managed testing
    - Evaluated qualifications before upgrade certification
    - Documented OJT in six-part training folder
  - Managed the career development course program
  - Updated the training management report roster monthly
  - Briefed the squadron commander monthly on the status of airmen qualifications, squadron OJT program status, deficiencies and corrective actions
  - Attended base training meetings
- 

#### Scoring

- 4: Criteria met.
- 3: Deficiencies were minor, primarily administrative in nature, and unlikely to compromise unit readiness.

- 2: Partial compliance with evaluation criteria. For example, procedures were established to accomplish criteria; however, significant deficiencies existed in implementation.
- 1: Minimal compliance with several evaluation criteria. Numerous deficiencies existed. Procedures in place were insufficient to meet mission requirements.
- 0: Unit training program failed to meet minimum provisions of the evaluation criteria. Program documentation was inaccurate, resulting in poor mission readiness or inhibited advancement opportunities for squadron personnel.

NA: Not scored.

---

**Protocol**

Protocol 13 is the pertinent protocol for this element.

---

**Inspector  
Contact**

For assistance interpreting this element, please call DSN 246-1771/2566 and request an AE enlisted inspector.

---

**Reference(s)**

AFI 36-2201 (Vols 1-6); AFI 36-2247; CFETP (AFSC specific)

## Element LDR.3.1.3 (formerly CO.1.2.3)

### Supervisory Involvement – On-the-Job Training (OJT)

---

#### Evaluation Criteria

- Squadron supervisors:
    - Ensured a master training plan (MTP) and current master career field and education training plan (MCFETP) were developed that identified qualification and skill-level requirements for each workcenter and position core, duty and critical tasks (MCFETP, formally known as master task listing - MTL)
  - Managed OJT documentation in the 6-part training folder
    - Records reflected accurate and current qualifications and training requirements
    - Appropriately supplemented the CFETP with other approved documents for 100 percent task identification and training requirements. If applicable, the following were used to supplement the CFETP; AF Job Qualification Standard (AFJQS), Specialty Training Standard (STS), Qualification Training Packages (QTP), AF Form 797 *Job Qualification Standard Continuation*, AF Form 1098 *Special Task Certification and Recurring Training*, AF Form 3831, *Ground Training*
    - Orientated trainees to the workcenter
    - Initial evaluation of knowledge and skills were conducted and documented within 90 days of assignment (utilizing the AETC Form 156, CFETP and, if applicable, the AFJQS, STS, AF Forms 797 and 1098)
    - Trainees were assigned the appropriate training status code
    - Certifiers evaluated and validated core and critical tasks
    - Verified that the trainee had completed, with documented evidence, all upgrade and training requirements before recommending a skill-level upgrade
  - Administered the workcenter CDC program to ensure
    - Trainees were enrolled in required CDCs
    - Developed and adhered to appropriate time frames for completion of CDCs
    - Volume review exercises were reviewed, scored and documented
    - End-of-course Form 9s were reviewed with documented review training
  - Attended squadron education and training meetings
- 

#### Scoring

- Note: Element rating is determined using a combination of criteria:
- Review of 6-part training folder documentation
  - Assessment of program management (duties and responsibilities of the supervisor as defined in CFETPs, AFI 36-2201 (Vols 1-6))

4: Criteria met.

- 3: Deficiencies were minor, primarily administrative in nature, and unlikely to compromise individual training progress or mission readiness.
- 2: Seventy percent or more of the reviewed 6-part training records met documentation evaluation criteria. Partial compliance with evaluation criteria. For example:
  - MTPs were not accomplished for all functional work centers
  - VREs (EOC) review training had not been accomplished
- 1: Seventy percent or less of reviewed 6-part training records met documentation evaluation criteria. Minimal compliance with evaluation criteria. For example:
  - Initial evaluations of knowledge/skills were not accomplished
  - MTPs and/or MCFETPs were not accomplished
  - Personnel had been upgraded without meeting all requirements
- 0: Criteria met for less than 50 percent of reviewed 6-part training folders. Personnel job proficiency and mission capability questionable, which directly limited squadron mission readiness and adversely impacted advancement opportunities for assigned squadron personnel.

NA: Not scored.

---

<b>Protocol</b>	Protocol 13 is the pertinent protocol for this element.
<b>Inspector Contact</b>	For assistance interpreting this element, please call DSN 246-1771/2566 and request an AE enlisted inspector.
<b>Reference(s)</b>	AFI 36-2201 (Vols 1-6); CFETP (AFSC specific)

---

## Element LDR.3.1.4 (formerly CO.1.2.4)

### Basic Life Support (BLS) Training

<b>Evaluation Criteria</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- All personnel received BLS training as required by AFI 44-102</li><li>- There was an effective management system in place for scheduling, training, tracking and reporting individual and squadron currency</li></ul>
<b>Scoring</b>	<p>4. Criteria met.</p> <p>3. Deficiencies were minor, primarily administrative in nature, and unlikely to have an adverse mission impact. BLS currency for squadron personnel sustained at 85-95 percent over 12 months.</p> <p>2. Some, but not all criteria were met. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• BLS currency for squadron personnel sustained at 75-85 percent over 12 months</li><li>• Ineffective management system in place for tracking training</li></ul> <p>1: Adverse patient outcome was likely to occur. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• BLS currency for squadron personnel sustained at less than 75 percent over 12 months</li><li>• Training program was in place but ineffective or maintained in such a manner that assessment of the squadron's BLS training rate was not feasible</li></ul> <p>0: There was no BLS training program in place. Emergency response capabilities were adversely affected and patient care was compromised.</p> <p>N/A: Not scored.</p>
<b>Protocol</b>	There is no protocol for this element.
<b>Inspector Contact</b>	For assistance interpreting this element, please call DSN 246-1771/2566 and request an AE nurse inspector.
<b>Reference(s)</b>	AFI 44-102